arXiv:1609.09680v1 [math.AP] 30 Sep 2016

PARTIAL REGULARITY OF SOLUTIONS TO THE SECOND BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEM FOR GENERATED JACOBIAN EQUATIONS

YASH JHAVERI

Abstract. We prove that outside of a closed singular set of measure zero solutions to the second boundary value problem for generated Jacobian equations are smooth.

1. Introduction

In this paper, we extend the partial regularity result of De Philippis and Figalli on solutions to the optimal transport problem for general cost on $\mathbb{R}^n$ ([1, Theorem 1.3]) to solutions to the second boundary value problem for generated Jacobian equations for general generating functions. The framework of generated Jacobian equations encompasses, besides the optimal transport problem for general cost, many problems in geometric optics (see [6] for a discussion of some of these problems as well as the many references therein).

Generated Jacobian equations arise as a particular case of prescribed Jacobian equations, that is, equations of the form:

$$\det(\nabla[\mathbf{T}(x,\mathbf{u},\nabla\mathbf{u})]) = \psi(x,\mathbf{u},\nabla\mathbf{u}) \tag{1.1}$$

where $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}(x,u,p) : \operatorname{dom}\mathbf{T} \subset X \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\psi = \psi(x,u,p) : X \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$. The second boundary value problem for prescribed Jacobian equations asks that

$$\mathbf{T}(\cdot,\mathbf{u},\nabla\mathbf{u})(X) = Y \tag{1.2}$$

for some given $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$; we consider the specific case when this prescription is given through the push-forward condition $\mathbf{T}(\cdot,\mathbf{u},\nabla\mathbf{u})_{\#}f = g$ for two probability densities f and g supported in X and Y respectively, and we call $\mathbf{T}$ the *transport map associated to* $\mathbf{G}$ *and* $\mathbf{u}$. This corresponds to

$$\psi(x,u,p) = \frac{f(x)}{g \circ \mathbf{T}(x,u,p)}. \tag{1.3}$$

When the map $\mathbf{T}$ is generated by a function $\mathbf{G} : \operatorname{dom}\mathbf{G} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, we find ourselves in the world of generated Jacobian equations. For example, letting $\mathbf{G}(x,y,v) = -c(x,y) - v$, we obtain the optimal transport problem for cost c. In this instance, the map $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}(x,p)$ is generated by the equation

$$D_x\mathbf{G}(x,\mathbf{T}(x,p)) = -D_xc(x,\mathbf{T}(x,p)) = p. \tag{1.4}$$

Generally, the map $\mathbf{T}$ (along with another $\mathbf{V}$) is generated through the system of equations

$$\begin{cases} D_x\mathbf{G}(x,\mathbf{T}(x,u,p),\mathbf{V}(x,u,p)) = p \\ \mathbf{G}(x,\mathbf{T}(x,u,p),\mathbf{V}(x,u,p)) = u. \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

As such, $\mathbf{G}$ must satisfy a collection of structure conditions to ensure the production of the map $\mathbf{T}$.

Let $X, Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, and $V \subset \mathbb{R}$ all be open. First, assume that $\mathbf{G} : X \times Y \times V \to \mathbb{R}$ is such that

(G0) $D_v\mathbf{G} < 0$.

Thanks to (G0), there exists a unique function $\mathbf{H}$ determined by the equation

$$\mathbf{G}(x,y,\mathbf{H}(x,y,u)) = u,$$

and $\mathbf{H}(x,y,\cdot)$ is well-defined on the (nonempty) open interval $U_{x,y} := \mathbf{G}(x,y,V)$. We call $\mathbf{H}$ the *dual* of $\mathbf{G}$ (see Remark 1.1). Now, assume the existence of a constant $\underline{u} \geq -\infty$ such that $(\underline{u},\infty) \subset U_{x,y}$. Set $V_{x,y} := \{v : \mathbf{G}(x,y,v) \in U_{x,y}\}$, define

$$\Omega := \{(x,y,v) : v \in V_{x,y}\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Upsilon := \{(x,y,u) : u \in U_{x,y}\},$$

and suppose that $\mathbf{G}$ additionally satisfies

(G1) $\mathbf{G}$ is of class C^2 and $\|\mathbf{G}\|_{C^2(X\times Y\times\mathcal{K})} < \infty$ for all $\mathcal{K} \subset V$ compact.
(G2) The map $(y,v) \mapsto (D_x\mathbf{G}(x,y,v), \mathbf{G}(x,y,v))$ is injective in $\{(y,v) : (x,y,v) \in \Omega\}$.
(G3) The map $x \mapsto -D_y\mathbf{G}(x,y,v)/D_v\mathbf{G}(x,y,v)$ is injective in $\{x : (x,y,v) \in \Omega\}$.
(G4) $\det(D_{xy}\mathbf{G} - D_{xv}\mathbf{G} \otimes (D_y\mathbf{G}/D_v\mathbf{G})) \neq 0$ in Ω.
(G5) $|D_x\mathbf{G}(x,y,v)| \leq \bar{L}$ in $\{(x,y,v) : \mathbf{G}(x,y,v) > \underline{u}\}$

Remark 1.1 (Duality of $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{H}$)**.** By construction, $D_u\mathbf{H} < 0$ ((H0)) and $\mathbf{H}$ is of class C^2 and the C^2-norm of $\mathbf{H}$ is locally finite ((H1)). Furthermore, one can see that

(H2) The map $(x,u) \mapsto (D_y\mathbf{H}(x,y,u), \mathbf{H}(x,y,u))$ is injective in $\{(x,u) : (x,y,u) \in \Upsilon\}$.
(H3) The map $y \mapsto -D_x\mathbf{H}(x,y,u)/D_u\mathbf{H}(x,y,u)$ is injective in $\{y : (x,y,u) \in \Upsilon\}$.
(H4) $\det(D_{yx}\mathbf{H} - D_{yu}\mathbf{H} \otimes (D_x\mathbf{H}/D_u\mathbf{H})) \neq 0$ in Υ.

In particular, (G0) and (H0), (G1) and (H1), (G2) and (H3), (G3) and (H2), and (G4) and (H4) are equivalent (see [6, Remark 9.5] and [8]). Moreover, with $\mathbf{H}$, one can generate the map $\mathbf{S}$ (along with $\mathbf{U}$) and look to solve the dual generated Jacobian equation

$$\det(\nabla[\mathbf{S}(y,\mathbf{v},\nabla\mathbf{v})]) = \frac{g(y)}{f\circ\mathbf{S}(y,\mathbf{v},\nabla\mathbf{v})} \tag{1.6}$$

(cf. (1.5)). We will often use the following identities:

$$D_x\mathbf{H} = -\frac{D_x\mathbf{G}}{D_v\mathbf{G}}, \qquad D_y\mathbf{H} = -\frac{D_y\mathbf{G}}{D_v\mathbf{G}}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad D_u\mathbf{H} = \frac{1}{D_v\mathbf{G}}.$$

Here, the derivatives in $\mathbf{H}$ are evaluated at (x,y,u) and the derivatives in $\mathbf{G}$ at $(x,y,\mathbf{H}(x,y,u))$.

While (G2) alone is sufficient to generate $\mathbf{T}$, the conditions (G0) – (G5) guarantee the existence of a solution to (1.1) – (1.3). In particular, Trudinger shows the following in [8]:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $X,Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and bounded, $V \subset \mathbb{R}$ be open, $\mathbf{G} : X\times Y\times V \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy (G0) – (G5), and $f : X \to \mathbb{R}^+$ and $g : Y \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be two probability densities supported on X and Y respectively. Then, for any $x_0 \in X$ and $u_0 > \underline{u} + \bar{L}\operatorname{diam}(X)$, there exists a solution $\mathbf{u}$ to* (1.1) – (1.3) *such that $\mathbf{u}(x_0) = u_0$.*

In [8], the interior regularity of solutions to our second boundary value is also studied. Under a pair of higher-order structural assumptions on the generating function $\mathbf{G}$ and a geometric condition on Y, solutions are proved to be smooth (given smooth enough densities). These assumptions are extensions of the MTW condition and the c^*-convexity requirement of the target domain in the optimal transport problem for general cost (see [7]). We refer the reader to [6] for other results on the interior regularity of solutions to general generated Jacobian equations under different, but related, additional conditions on the structure of $\mathbf{G}$ and on the geometry of the domain of the equation.

The purpose of this paper is to show that solutions to (1.1) – (1.3) are smooth outside a singular set of measure zero without the presence of any conditions on $\mathbf{G}$ and Y other than those used to obtain the existence of a solution. Precisely, our main result is the following:

Theorem 1.3. *Let $X,Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and bounded, $V \subset \mathbb{R}$ be open, $\mathbf{G} : X\times Y\times V \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy (G0) – (G5), $f : X \to \mathbb{R}^+$ and $g : Y \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be two continuous probability densities bounded away from zero and infinity on X and Y respectively, and $\mathbf{u}$ be a solution to* (1.1) – (1.3)*. Set $\mathbf{T} : X \to Y$ to be the transport map associated to $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{u}$. Then, there exist two relatively closed sets $\Sigma_X \subset X$*

and $\Sigma_Y \subset Y$ of measure zero such that $\mathbf{T} : X \setminus \Sigma_X \to Y \setminus \Sigma_Y$ is a homeomorphism of class $C^{0,\beta}_{\text{loc}}$ for any $\beta < 1$. In addition, if $\mathbf{G} \in C^{k+2,\alpha}_{\text{loc}}(X \times Y \times V)$, $f \in C^{k+\alpha}_{\text{loc}}(X)$, and $g \in C^{k+\alpha}_{\text{loc}}(Y)$ for some $k \geq 0$ and $\alpha \in (0,1)$, then $\mathbf{T} : X \setminus \Sigma_X \to Y \setminus \Sigma_Y$ is a diffeomorphism of class $C^{k+1,\alpha}_{\text{loc}}$.

We remark that (G5) is only used to establish the existence of $\mathbf{u}$; it will play no role in our analysis.

The proof of Theorem 1.3 follows the proof of its predecessor in [1].

This paper has four additional sections. In Section 2, we introduce some more notation and some preliminary results. Section 3 is dedicated to the proof Theorem 1.3. Finally, in the last two sections we prove the local regularity results around which the proof of our main result revolves.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **G-convexity.** As illustrated in [8], solutions to (1.1) – (1.3) are **G**-convex functions. In particular, given a generating function **G** satisfying (G0) – (G4), a (continuous) **G**-convex function $\mathbf{u} : X \to \mathbb{R}$, and a non-negative, integrable function g, one can construct a Radon measure $\mu_g[\mathbf{u}]$ on X defined by

$$\mu_g[\mathbf{u}](E) := \int_{\partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(E)} g(y)\,\mathrm{d}y \quad \forall E \subset X \text{ Borel};$$

a solution to (1.1) – (1.3) is a **G**-convex function $\mathbf{u}$ that satisfies $\mu_g[\mathbf{u}] = f$.

Let us recall the definition of **G**-convexity and some related facts, definitions, and characteristics (in turn, making sense of the measure $\mu_g[\mathbf{u}]$).

We say that a function $\mathbf{u} : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is **G**-*convex* if for all $x_0 \in X$, there exists a *focus* (y_0, v_0) such that

$$\mathbf{u}(x_0) = \mathbf{G}(x_0, y_0, v_0) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbf{u}(x) \geq \mathbf{G}(x, y_0, v_0) \quad \forall x \in X. \tag{2.1}$$

Notice that if (y_0, v_0) and (y_0, v_1) are foci for a **G**-convex function $\mathbf{u}$ at the point x_0, then, by (G0), $v_0 = v_1 = \mathbf{H}(x_0, y_0, \mathbf{u}(x_0))$. So, we can recast (2.1) and say that $\mathbf{u} : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is **G**-convex if for all $x_0 \in X$, there exists a point $y_0 \in Y$ such that

$$\mathbf{u}(x_0) = \mathbf{G}(x_0, y_0, \mathbf{H}(x_0, y_0, \mathbf{u}(x_0))) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbf{u}(x) \geq \mathbf{G}(x, y_0, \mathbf{H}(x_0, y_0, \mathbf{u}(x_0))) \quad \forall x \in X. \tag{2.2}$$

An equivalent formulation of **G**-convexity is the following: a function $\mathbf{u} : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is **G**-convex if it can be written as

$$\mathbf{u}(x) = \sup_{y \in Y} \mathbf{G}(x, y, v_y) \tag{2.3}$$

for some constants v_y; in this formulation, the focus is the pair (y, v_y) at which the supremum in (2.3) is attained. Taking $\mathbf{G}(x, y, v) = x \cdot y - v$, we see that **G**-convexity is indeed a generalization of convexity.

For a **G**-convex function $\mathbf{u} : X \to \mathbb{R}$, we define its **G**-*subdifferential* at x_0 to be the (nonempty) set

$$\partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(x_0) := \{y \in Y : \mathbf{u}(x) \geq \mathbf{G}(x, y, \mathbf{H}(x_0, y, \mathbf{u}(x_0))) \quad \forall x \in X\}.$$

Given $y \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(x_0)$, we call

$$\mathscr{G}_{x_0,y,v}(\cdot) := \mathbf{G}(\cdot, y, v)$$

with $v = \mathbf{H}(x_0, y, \mathbf{u}(x_0))$ a **G**-*support* of $\mathbf{u}$ at x_0. Recalling the *(Fréchet) subdifferential* of a function $\mathbf{u}$ at x_0:

$$\partial^- \mathbf{u}(x_0) := \{p \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{u}(x) \geq \mathbf{u}(x_0) + p \cdot (x - x_0) + o(|x - x_0|)\},$$

we see that

$$y \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(x_0) \quad \Rightarrow \quad D_x\mathbf{G}(x_0, y, \mathbf{H}(x_0, y, \mathbf{u}(x_0))) \in \partial^- \mathbf{u}(x_0). \tag{2.4}$$

For $E \subset X$, we set

$$\partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(E) := \bigcup_{x \in E} \partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(x) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \partial^- \mathbf{u}(E) := \bigcup_{x \in E} \partial^- \mathbf{u}(x).$$

Akin to the Legendre transform, we define the $\mathbf{G}$-*transform* of $\mathbf{u}$ to be the $\mathbf{H}$-convex function given by

$$\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{G}}(y) := \sup_{x\in X} \mathbf{H}(x, y, \mathbf{u}(x)). \tag{2.5}$$

The $\mathbf{G}$-convexity of $\mathbf{u}$ implies that $\mathbf{u}(x) \in U_{x,y}$ whenever $y \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(x)$, and so the supremum in (2.5) is over a nonempty set. Moreover,

$$\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{GH}} = \mathbf{u}$$

where $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{H}}(x) := \sup_{y\in Y} \mathbf{G}(x, y, \mathbf{v}(y))$ is, as expected, the $\mathbf{H}$-transform of a given $\mathbf{H}$-convex function $\mathbf{v} : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ (cf. the Legendre transform is an involution on convex functions.) Also,

$$y \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(x) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad x \in \partial_{\mathbf{H}}\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{G}}(y). \tag{2.6}$$

Notice that until now we have only used (G0). Another important property of $\mathbf{G}$-convex functions is they are locally semi-convex provided $\mathbf{G}$ satisfies (G1). In particular, $\mathbf{G}$-convex functions are locally uniformly Lipschitz and twice differentiable at almost every point. (See, e.g., [3].)

As noted before, since $\mathbf{G}$ satisfies (G2), one can generate the maps $\mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,u}(\cdot)$ and $\mathbf{V}_x(\cdot,\cdot)$ from the pair of equations

$$\begin{cases} D_x\mathbf{G}(x, \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,u}(p), \mathbf{V}_x(u, p)) = p \\ \mathbf{G}(x, \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,u}(p), \mathbf{V}_x(u, p)) = u. \end{cases}$$

In other words,

$$\mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,u}(p) = y \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad p = D_x\mathbf{G}(x, y, \mathbf{H}(x, y, u))$$

and

$$\mathbf{V}_x(u, p) = \mathbf{H}(x, \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,u}(p), u).$$

Also, (2.4) can be rewritten as

$$\partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(x_0) \subset \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x_0,\mathbf{u}(x_0)}(\partial^-\mathbf{u}(x_0)), \tag{2.7}$$

from which we see that if $\mathbf{u}$ is differentiable at x_0, then $\partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(x_0)$ is a singleton and

$$\nabla\mathbf{u}(x_0) = D_x\mathbf{G}(x_0, y_0, v_0) \tag{2.8}$$

where

$$y_0 = \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x_0,\mathbf{u}(x_0)}(\nabla\mathbf{u}(x_0)) \qquad \text{and} \qquad v_0 = \mathbf{H}(x_0, \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x_0,\mathbf{u}(x_0)}(\nabla\mathbf{u}(x_0)), \mathbf{u}(x_0)).$$

Moreover, if $\mathbf{u}$ is twice differentiable at x_0, then

$$D^2\mathbf{u}(x_0) \geq D_x^2\mathbf{G}(x_0, y_0, v_0). \tag{2.9}$$

Finally, given a $\mathbf{G}$-convex function $\mathbf{u} : X \to \mathbb{R}$, define the map (at almost every $x \in X$) $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}}$ by

$$\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}}(x) := \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{u}(x)}(\nabla\mathbf{u}(x)).$$

(Even though $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}}$ depends not only on $\mathbf{u}$ but on $\mathbf{G}$, we suppress this last dependence for notational simplicity.)

2.2. **A Monge-Ampère-type Equation.** Given $\mathbf{G}$ satisfying (G0) – (G4), the push-forward condition $(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}})_{\#}f = g$ and [9, Theorem 11.1] together imply that

$$|\det(\nabla\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}}(x))| = \frac{f(x)}{g(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}}(x))} \quad \text{a.e.}$$

Then, (2.8) and (2.9) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} &\det(D^2\mathbf{u}(x) - D_x^2\mathbf{G}(x, \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{u}(x)}(\nabla\mathbf{u}(x)), \mathbf{V}_x(\mathbf{u}(x), \nabla\mathbf{u}(x)))) \\ &\quad = |\det(\mathbf{E}(x, \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{u}(x)}(\nabla\mathbf{u}(x)), \mathbf{V}_x(\mathbf{u}(x), \nabla\mathbf{u}(x))))| \frac{f(x)}{g(\mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{u}(x)}(\nabla\mathbf{u}(x)))} \quad \text{a.e.} \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Here, $\mathbf{E}$ is the $n \times n$ matrix from (G4):

$$\mathbf{E}(x,y,v) := \left[D_{xy}\mathbf{G} - D_{xv}\mathbf{G} \otimes \frac{D_y \mathbf{G}}{D_v \mathbf{G}} \right](x,y,v). \tag{2.11}$$

Since, by (G4), $\mathbf{E}$ has nonzero determinant, the nondegeneracy of the right-hand side of our Monge-Ampère-type equation (2.10) is preserved; recall, f and g are positive. (See [8] for more details.) In conclusion, a solution $\mathbf{u}$ to (1.1) – (1.3) satisfies a Monge-Ampère-type equation almost everywhere.

2.3. **Compactness.** In [8], Trudinger remarks that if a sequence of $\mathbf{G}$-convex functions $\mathbf{u}_j$ converges locally uniformly to a function $\mathbf{u}$, which will be $\mathbf{G}$-convex function, then $\mu_g[\mathbf{u}_j]$ converges weakly* to $\mu_g[\mathbf{u}]$. It will be convenient to have the following more general compactness result:

Proposition 2.1. *Let $X, Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $V \subset \mathbb{R}$ be open and $\mathbf{G}_j, \mathbf{G} : X \times Y \times V \to \mathbb{R}$ be a family of functions satisfying (G0) – (G4). Suppose that $\mathbf{G}_j$ converges locally uniformly to $\mathbf{G}$. Furthermore, let $g_j : Y \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be a sequence of densities converging weakly* in L^∞ to a density $g : Y \to \mathbb{R}^+$. If $\mathbf{u}_j : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is a sequence of $\mathbf{G}_j$-convex functions converging locally uniformly to a $\mathbf{G}$-convex function $\mathbf{u}$, then the associated measures $\mu_{g_j}[\mathbf{u}_j]$ converge weakly* to $\mu_g[u]$.*

Proof. First, observe that

$$\partial_{\mathbf{G}} \mathbf{u}(\mathcal{C}) \supset \limsup_{j\to\infty} \partial_{\mathbf{G}_j} \mathbf{u}_j(\mathcal{C}) \quad \forall \mathcal{C} \subset X \text{ compact.} \tag{2.12}$$

Indeed, fix $\mathcal{C} \subset X$ compact and consider $y_0 \in \limsup_{j\to\infty} \partial_{\mathbf{G}_j} \mathbf{u}_j(\mathcal{C})$. Since

$$\limsup_{j\to\infty} \partial_{\mathbf{G}_j} \mathbf{u}_j(\mathcal{C}) := \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{j=i}^{\infty} \partial_{\mathbf{G}_j} \mathbf{u}_j(\mathcal{C}),$$

we see that there exists a subsequence $j_k \to \infty$ such that $y_0 \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}_{j_k}} \mathbf{u}_{j_k}(\mathcal{C})$. In other words, $y_0 \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}_{j_k}} \mathbf{u}_{j_k}(x_{j_k})$ for some $x_{j_k} \in \mathcal{C}$. Up to a further subsequence, we have that $x_{j_k} \to x_0 \in \mathcal{C}$. It follows that

$$\mathbf{u}_{j_k}(x) \geq \mathbf{G}_{j_k}(x, y_0, \mathbf{H}_{j_k}(x_{j_k}, y_0, \mathbf{u}_{j_k}(x_{j_k}))) \quad \forall x \in X.$$

Hence, letting $k \to \infty$, we find that $y_0 \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}} \mathbf{u}(x_0) \subset \partial_{\mathbf{G}} \mathbf{u}(\mathcal{C})$, as desired.

Second, notice that

$$\partial_{\mathbf{G}} \mathbf{u}(\mathcal{O}) \setminus \mathcal{Z} \subset \liminf_{j\to\infty} \partial_{\mathbf{G}_j} \mathbf{u}_j(\mathcal{O}) \quad \forall \mathcal{O} \Subset X \text{ open.} \tag{2.13}$$

Here, $\mathcal{Z} := \{y : \text{ there exists } x_1 \neq x_2 \text{ such that } y \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}} \mathbf{u}(x_1) \cap \partial_{\mathbf{G}} \mathbf{u}(x_2)\}$. Recall that $|\mathcal{Z}| = 0$ by the local semi-convexity of $\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{G}}$ (see, e.g., [7, Lemma 3.1]). To this end, let $\mathcal{O} \Subset X$ be open. We need to show

$$\partial_{\mathbf{G}} \mathbf{u}(\mathcal{O}) \setminus \mathcal{Z} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{j=i}^{\infty} \partial_{\mathbf{G}_j} \mathbf{u}_j(\mathcal{O}).$$

Fix $y_0 \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}} \mathbf{u}(\mathcal{O}) \setminus \mathcal{Z}$. Then, $y_0 \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}} \mathbf{u}(x_0)$ for some $x_0 \in \mathcal{O}$ and $y_0 \notin \partial_{\mathbf{G}} \mathbf{u}(x)$ for any $x \in X \setminus \{x_0\}$. It follows that

$$\mathbf{u}(x) > \mathbf{G}(x, y_0, v_0) \quad \forall x \in X \setminus \{x_0\}$$

where $v_0 := \mathbf{H}(x_0, y_0, \mathbf{u}(x_0))$. Set

$$\mathbf{w}_j(x) := \mathbf{u}_j(x) - \mathbf{G}_j(x, y_0, v_0) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbf{w}(x) := \mathbf{u}(x) - \mathbf{G}(x, y_0, v_0).$$

As $\mathbf{w}_j \to \mathbf{w}$ locally uniformly and $\mathcal{O} \Subset X$, we see that $\mathbf{w}_j$ attains a minimum over $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$ not at the boundary but well inside $\mathcal{O}$ (arbitrarily close to x_0 in fact) for all $j \gg 1$. Now, starting with $\mathbf{G}_j(\cdot, y_0, v_0)$, increase and then decrease v_0 to v_j until $\mathbf{G}_j(\cdot, y_0, v_j)$ touches $\mathbf{u}_j$ from below for $j \gg 1$. The point at which $\mathbf{G}_j(\cdot, y_0, v_j)$ touches $\mathbf{u}_j$, call it x_j, lives in $\mathcal{O}$ for $j \gg 1$ as x_j must converge to x_0. In other words, $y_0 \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}_j} \mathbf{u}_j(x_j) \subset \partial_{\mathbf{G}_j} \mathbf{u}_j(\mathcal{O})$ for $j \gg 1$.

From (2.12) and (2.13), it follows that $\mu_h[\mathbf{u}_j]$ converges weakly* to $\mu_h[\mathbf{u}]$ as $j \to \infty$ for any density h supported in Y.

To conclude, observe that as $g_k \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} g$ (in L^∞), for any fixed $\mathbf{w}$ which is convex with respect to some generating function, $\mu_{g_k}[\mathbf{w}] \to \mu_g[\mathbf{w}]$ (strongly). So,

$$\mu_{g_k}[\mathbf{u}_j] \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mu_{g_k}[\mathbf{u}] \to \mu_g[\mathbf{u}] \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mu_{g_k}[\mathbf{u}_j] \to \mu_g[\mathbf{u}_j] \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mu_g[\mathbf{u}].$$

Taking the diagonal sequence, we see that $\mu_{g_j}[\mathbf{u}_j] \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mu_g[\mathbf{u}]$. □

3. Proof of Theorem 1.3

Set $\mathbf{v} := \mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{G}}$. Then, $\mathbf{v}$ is a solution to the second boundary value problem for the dual equation (1.6) (see [8, Lemma 4.1]). Recall that $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ are twice differentiable almost everywhere; let X_1 and Y_1 be the full measure subsets of X and Y respectively on which $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ are, respectively, twice differentiable. In particular, from (2.6), we see that $\mathbf{T}_\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{S}_\mathbf{v}$ are inverses of one another in the sense that

$$\mathbf{S}_\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{T}_\mathbf{u}(x)) = x \quad \forall x \in X_1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{S}_\mathbf{v}(y)) \quad \forall y \in Y_1. \tag{3.1}$$

Here, of course, $\mathbf{S}_\mathbf{v}(y) := \mathbf{H}\text{-}\exp_{y,\mathbf{v}(y)}(\nabla \mathbf{v}(y))$. Consider the set

$$X' := X_1 \cap \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{u}^{-1}(Y_1).$$

As $(\mathbf{T}_\mathbf{u})_\# f = g$ and the densities f and g are bounded away from zero and infinity, we find that X' is also of full measure in X.

Fix $x' \in X'$. The $\mathbf{G}$-subdifferential of $\mathbf{u}$ at x' is a singleton, $\partial_\mathbf{G}\mathbf{u}(x') = \{\mathbf{T}_\mathbf{u}(x')\}$. Set $y' := \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{u}(x')$ and $v' := \mathbf{H}(x', \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{u}(x'), \mathbf{u}(x')))$. Up to a translation, we can assume that $(x', y', v') = (0, 0, 0)$ (see the begining of Step 4 in the proof of Theorem 4.3). Define

$$\hat{\mathbf{G}}(x, y, v) := \mathbf{G}(x, y, v + \mathbf{H}(0, y, \mathbf{u}(0))) - \mathbf{G}(x, 0, 0).$$

Clearly, the dual of $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$ is

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}}(x, y, u) := \mathbf{H}(x, y, u + \mathbf{G}(x, 0, 0)) - \mathbf{H}(0, y, \mathbf{u}(0)).$$

Simple computations show that $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$ satisfies (G0) – (G4) ((G5) too).

Now, let

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}}(x) := \mathbf{u}(x) - \mathbf{G}(x, 0, 0).$$

Then, $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ is $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$-convex and $\mathbf{T}_{\hat{\mathbf{u}}} = \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{u}$. Furthermore, the $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$-transform of $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ is

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}(y) := \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}}(y) = \mathbf{v}(y) - \mathbf{H}(0, y, \mathbf{u}(0))$$

and $\mathbf{S}_{\hat{\mathbf{v}}} = \mathbf{S}_\mathbf{v}$.

Taylor expanding $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ around $(0, 0, 0)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathbf{G}}(x, y, v) = {} & D_v\hat{\mathbf{G}}(0, 0, 0)v + D_{xy}\hat{\mathbf{G}}(0, 0, 0)x \cdot y \\ & + D_{xv}\hat{\mathbf{G}}(0, 0, 0) \cdot vx + D_{yv}\hat{\mathbf{G}}(0, 0, 0) \cdot vy + \frac{1}{2}D_v^2\hat{\mathbf{G}}(0, 0, 0)v^2 + o(|x|^2 + |y|^2 + |v|^2)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}}(x) = \frac{1}{2}D^2\hat{\mathbf{u}}(0)x \cdot x + o(|x|^2).$$

Let $a := -D_v\hat{\mathbf{G}}(0, 0, 0) > 0$, $P := D^2\hat{\mathbf{u}}(0)$, and $M := D_{xy}\hat{\mathbf{G}}(0, 0, 0)$. From (G4) applied to $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$ and (2.10) applied to $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$, observe that $\det(M), \det(P) \neq 0$. So, recalling (2.9), we see that P is positive definite (and symmetric). Therefore, after the change coordinates

$$(x, y, v) \mapsto (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{v}) := (P^{1/2}x, P^{-1/2}M^t y, av),$$

we deduce that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{G}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{v}) := \hat{\mathbf{G}}(x, y, v) = -\tilde{v} + \tilde{x} \cdot \tilde{y} + b_1 \cdot \tilde{v}\tilde{x} + b_2 \cdot \tilde{v}\tilde{y} + c_3\tilde{v}^2 + o(|\tilde{x}|^2 + |\tilde{y}|^2 + |\tilde{v}|^2) \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(\tilde{x}) := \hat{\mathbf{u}}(x) = \frac{1}{2}|\tilde{x}|^2 + o(|\tilde{x}|^2). \tag{3.3}$$

Additionally, letting $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}$ be the dual of $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$, we see that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{H}}(\tilde{x},\tilde{y},\tilde{u}) = \hat{\mathbf{H}}(x,y,u) = -\tilde{u} + \tilde{x}\cdot\tilde{y} + b_1'\cdot\tilde{u}\tilde{x} + b_2'\cdot\tilde{u}\tilde{y} + c_3'\tilde{u}^2 + o(|\tilde{x}|^2+|\tilde{y}|^2+|\tilde{u}|^2). \tag{3.4}$$

Here, $\tilde{u} := u/a$. Moreover, $(\mathbf{T}_{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}})_{\#}\tilde{f} = \tilde{g}$ where

$$\tilde{f}(\tilde{x}) := \det(P^{-1/2})f(P^{-1/2}\tilde{x}) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \tilde{g}(\tilde{y}) := |\det([M^t]^{-1}P^{1/2})|g([M^t]^{-1}P^{1/2}\tilde{y}). \tag{3.5}$$

Consequently, using (2.10), (3.2), and (3.3), we find that

$$\frac{\tilde{f}(0)}{\tilde{g}(0)} = \frac{\det(D^2\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(0) - D^2_{\tilde{x}}\tilde{\mathbf{G}}(0,0,0))}{|\det(D_{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}}\tilde{\mathbf{G}}(0,0,0))|} = 1. \tag{3.6}$$

Consider the rescalings[1]

$$\mathbf{u}_\lambda(\tilde{x}) := \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(\lambda\tilde{x})}{\lambda^2}, \qquad \mathbf{G}_\lambda(\tilde{x},\tilde{y},\tilde{v}) := \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{G}}(\lambda\tilde{x},\lambda\tilde{y},\lambda^2\tilde{v})}{\lambda^2}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbf{H}_\lambda(\tilde{x},\tilde{y},\tilde{u}) := \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{H}}(\lambda\tilde{x},\lambda\tilde{y},\lambda^2\tilde{u})}{\lambda^2}.$$

It follows that, $\mathbf{u}_\lambda$ is $\mathbf{G}_\lambda$-convex and $(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}_\lambda})_{\#}f_\lambda = g_\lambda$ where

$$f_\lambda(\tilde{x}) := \frac{\tilde{f}(\lambda\tilde{x})}{\tilde{f}(0)} \qquad \text{and} \qquad g_\lambda(\tilde{y}) := \frac{\tilde{g}(\lambda\tilde{y})}{\tilde{g}(0)}$$

(recall (3.6)).

The continuity of f and g implies that

$$\|f_\lambda - 1\|_{L^\infty} + \|g_\lambda - 1\|_{L^\infty} \to 0 \tag{3.7}$$

in B_3 as $\lambda \to 0$. Similarly, from (3.2), (3.3), and (3.4), we determine that

$$\|\mathbf{G}_\lambda - \tilde{x}\cdot\tilde{y} + \tilde{v}\|_{C^2(B_3\times B_3\times(-30,30))} \to 0, \tag{3.8}$$

$$\left\|\mathbf{u}_\lambda - \frac{1}{2}|\tilde{x}|^2\right\|_{C^0(B_3)} \to 0, \tag{3.9}$$

and

$$\|\mathbf{H}_\lambda - \tilde{x}\cdot\tilde{y} + \tilde{u}\|_{C^2(B_3\times B_3\times(-30,30))} \to 0 \tag{3.10}$$

all as $\lambda \to 0$.[2]

As $\tilde{u}$ is twice differentiable at 0, it follows that the (multivalued) map $\tilde{x} \mapsto \partial^-\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(\tilde{x})$ is differentiable at 0 (see [9, Theorem 14.25]). Moreover, from (3.3), we see that the gradient of this map at 0 is the identity matrix. Thus,

$$\partial^-\mathbf{u}_\lambda(\tilde{x}) \subset B_{r_\lambda}(\tilde{x}) \quad \forall \tilde{x} \in B_3.$$

Here, $r_\lambda \to 0$ as $\lambda \to 0$. By (2.7) and since $\|\mathbf{G}_\lambda\text{-exp} - \mathrm{Id}\,\|_{C^0(B_3)} \to 0$ as $\lambda \to 0$ ((3.8)), we obtain that

$$\partial_{\mathbf{G}_\lambda}\mathbf{u}_\lambda(\tilde{x}) \subset B_{R_\lambda}(\tilde{x}) \quad \forall \tilde{x} \in B_3 \tag{3.11}$$

where $R_\lambda \to 0$ as $\lambda \to 0$. Since $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}}$ is twice differentiable at 0, the $\mathbf{G}_\lambda$-transform of $\mathbf{u}_\lambda$ is also twice differentiable at 0; let $\mathbf{v}_\lambda$ be the $\mathbf{G}_\lambda$-transform of $\mathbf{u}_\lambda$. In addition, $D^2\mathbf{v}_\lambda(0) = \mathrm{Id}$,[3] and arguing like

[1] The model generating function, coming from the optimal transport problem with cost $-x\cdot y$, is invariant under parabolic rescalings: set

$$\mathbf{G}_\lambda(x,y,v) := \frac{\mathbf{G}(\lambda x,\lambda y,\lambda^2 v)}{\lambda^2};$$

if $\mathbf{G}(x,y,v) = x\cdot y - v$, then $\mathbf{G}_\lambda = \mathbf{G}$. Rescaling in this way suggests that $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$ does not need to account for $D_{xv}\mathbf{G}(0,0,0)$, $D_{yv}\mathbf{G}(0,0,0)$, or $D^2_v\mathbf{G}(0,0,0)$ being nonzero, a heuristic confirmation of our choice for $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$.

[2] The choice of $B_3\times B_3\times(-30,30)$ is discussed in the beginning of the next section.

[3] One can see this by differentiating the equations

$$\nabla\mathbf{u}_\lambda(\tilde{x}) = D_{\tilde{x}}\mathbf{G}_\lambda(\tilde{x},\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}_\lambda}(\tilde{x}),\mathbf{H}_\lambda(\tilde{x},\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}_\lambda}(\tilde{x}),\mathbf{u}_\lambda(\tilde{x})))$$

and

$$\nabla\mathbf{v}_\lambda(\tilde{y}) = D_{\tilde{y}}\mathbf{H}_\lambda(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{v}_\lambda}(\tilde{y}),\tilde{y},\mathbf{G}_\lambda(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{v}_\lambda}(\tilde{y}),\tilde{y},\mathbf{v}_\lambda(\tilde{y})))$$

at 0 and using (3.2), (3.4), and that $[\nabla\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}_\lambda}(0)]^{-1} = \nabla\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{v}_\lambda}(0)$.

before, we find that

$$\partial_{\mathbf{H}_\lambda} \mathbf{v}_\lambda(\tilde{y}) \subset B_{R'_\lambda}(\tilde{y}) \quad \forall \tilde{y} \in B_3$$

with $R'_\lambda \to 0$ as $\lambda \to 0$.

If

$$\mathcal{C}_1 := \overline{B}_1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{C}_2 := \partial_{\mathbf{G}_\lambda} \mathbf{u}_\lambda(\mathcal{C}_1)$$

and λ is sufficiently small, then we can force $B_{1/3} \subset \mathcal{C}_2 \subset B_3$ thanks to (3.11). Observe that $\mathcal{C}_2$ is closed as the $\mathbf{G}_\lambda$-subdifferential of a compact set. Finally, from (2.7), it follows that

$$\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}_\lambda}^{-1}(\mathcal{C}_2) \setminus \mathcal{C}_1 \subset \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}_\lambda}^{-1}(\{\text{non-differentiability points of } \mathbf{v}_\lambda\}).$$

Being that $|\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}_\lambda}^{-1}(\{\text{non-differentiability points of } \mathbf{v}_\lambda\})| = 0$, we deduce that

$$(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}_\lambda})_\#(f_\lambda \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}_1}) = g_\lambda \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}_2}.$$

Hence, for every $\beta < 1$, we see that the hypothesis of Theorem 4.3 are satisfied provided that $\lambda > 0$ is sufficiently small. If in addition $\mathbf{G} \in C^{k+2,\alpha}_{\text{loc}}(X \times Y \times V)$, $f \in C^{k+\alpha}_{\text{loc}}(X)$, and $g \in C^{k+\alpha}_{\text{loc}}(Y)$ for some $k \geq 0$ and $\alpha \in (0,1)$, the assumptions of Theorem 5.3 are also satisfied. So, applying Theorem 4.3 (respectively Theorem 5.3), we deduce that $\mathbf{u}_\lambda \in C^{1,\beta}(B_{1/7})$ (respectively $\mathbf{u}_\lambda \in C^{k+2,\alpha}(B_{1/9})$). In our original coordinates, we find that $\mathbf{u} \in C^{1,\beta}(\mathcal{U}_{x'})$ (respectively $\mathbf{u} \in C^{k+2,\alpha}(\mathcal{U}_{x'})$) for some open neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_{x'}$ of x', which, in turn, implies that $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}} \in C^{0,\beta}(\mathcal{U}_{x'})$ (respectively $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}} \in C^{k+1,\alpha}(\mathcal{U}_{x'})$). Using Corollary 4.5, we see that $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathcal{U}_{x'})$ contains an open neighborhood of y'. By symmetry, applying Theorem 4.3 (respectively Theorem 5.3) to $\mathbf{v}_\lambda$, there exists an open neighborhood $\mathcal{V}_{y'}$ of y' such that $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{v}} \in C^{0,\beta}(\mathcal{V}_{y'})$ (respectively $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{v}} \in C^{k+1,\alpha}(\mathcal{V}_{y'})$). Since $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{v}}$ and $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}}$ are inverses of each other (recall (3.1)), after shrinking $\mathcal{U}_{x'}$ if necessary, we determine that $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}}$ is a homeomorphism (respectively diffeomorphism) between $\mathcal{U}_{x'}$ and its image $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathcal{U}_{x'})$.

Let

$$X'' := \bigcup_{x' \in X'} \mathcal{U}_{x'} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Sigma_X := X \setminus X'',$$

and define

$$Y'' := \bigcup_{x' \in X'} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathcal{U}_{x'}) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Sigma_Y := Y \setminus Y''.$$

By definition, Σ_X and Σ_Y are relatively closed. Clearly, $|\Sigma_X| = 0$ as $X'' \supset X'$. Moreover, since $\Sigma_Y \subset Y \setminus \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}}(X')$ and $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}}(X')$ also has full measure, we have that $|\Sigma_Y| = 0$. Finally, by construction, $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}} : X \setminus \Sigma_X \to Y \setminus \Sigma_Y$ is a local homeomorphism (respectively diffeomorphism), which combined with (3.1) implies that $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}} : X \setminus \Sigma_X \to Y \setminus \Sigma_Y$ is actually a global homeomorphism (respectively diffeomorphism), as desired.

4. $C^{1,\beta}$-Regularity and Strict $\mathbf{G}$-convexity

In this section and the following, we prove that if a $\mathbf{G}$-convex function $\mathbf{u}$ is sufficiently close to the parabola $|x|^2/2$ in a ball for a generating function $\mathbf{G}$ that along with its dual $\mathbf{H}$ is close to the linear generating function and its dual $x \cdot y - v$ and $x \cdot y - u$ respectively, then $\mathbf{u}$ is smooth in a smaller ball.

Recall from the duality of $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{H}$ that $\mathbf{u}(x) = \mathbf{G}(x, y, \mathbf{H}(x, y, \mathbf{u}(x)))$. Hence, the inputs (x, y, u) for which $\mathbf{H}$ is assumed close to $x \cdot y - u$ must incorporate the points $(x, y, \mathbf{u}(x))$, and the inputs (x, y, v) for which $\mathbf{G}$ is assumed to be close to $x \cdot y - v$ must incorporate the points $(x, y, \mathbf{H}(x, y, \mathbf{u}(x)))$. Indeed, if $|\mathbf{u}(x)| < 2K$ for $x \in B_K$ and $\mathbf{H}$ is close to $x \cdot y - u$, then $|\mathbf{H}(x, y, \mathbf{u}(x))| < 2K^2 + 4K$ for $(x, y) \in B_K \times B_K$ (cf. the hypothesis of Theorem 4.3). So, we define

$$\mathcal{B}_K := B_K \times B_K \times (-2K^2 - 4K, 2K^2 + 4K) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}.$$

While the statements and proofs in this section and the next section are variants of those in [1], we present most all of the proofs in full detail.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ be two closed sets such that*

$$B_{1/K} \subset \mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2 \subset B_K \tag{4.1}$$

for some $K \geq 1$, f and g be two densities supported on $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ respectively, and $\mathbf{u} : \mathcal{C}_1 \to \mathbb{R}$ be a $\mathbf{G}$-convex function such that $\partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(\mathcal{C}_1) \subset B_K$ and $(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}})_{\#}f = g$. In addition, let $\rho > 0$ be such that $|\mathcal{C}_1| = |\rho\mathcal{C}_2|$ and $\mathbf{w}$ be a convex function such that $(\nabla\mathbf{w})_{\#}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}_1} = \mathbf{1}_{\rho\mathcal{C}_2}$ and $\mathbf{w}(0) = \mathbf{u}(0)$. Then, there exists an increasing function $\omega : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$, depending only on K, satisfying $\omega(\delta) \geq \delta$ and $\omega(0^+) = 0$ such that if

$$\|f - \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}_1}\|_{L^\infty} + \|g - \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}_2}\|_{L^\infty} \leq \delta \tag{4.2}$$

and

$$\|\mathbf{G} - x \cdot y + v\|_{C^2(\mathcal{B}_K)} + \|\mathbf{H} - x \cdot y + u\|_{C^2(\mathcal{B}_K)} \leq \delta, \tag{4.3}$$

then

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}\|_{C^0(B_{1/K})} \leq \omega(\delta). \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. Suppose, to the contrary, that the lemma is false. Then, there exists an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and sequences of closed sets $\mathcal{C}_1^j$ and $\mathcal{C}_2^j$ satisfying (4.1), functions f_j and g_j satisfying (4.2) with $\delta = 1/j$, and generating functions $\mathbf{G}_j$ satisfying (4.3) also with $\delta = 1/j$ such that

$$\mathbf{u}_j(0) = \mathbf{w}_j(0) = 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|\mathbf{u}_j - \mathbf{w}_j\|_{C^0(B_{1/K})} \geq \varepsilon_0 \tag{4.5}$$

where $\mathbf{u}_j$ and $\mathbf{w}_j$ are as in the statement of the lemma. Let us extend $\mathbf{u}_j$ and $\mathbf{w}_j$ to B_K, setting

$$\mathbf{u}_j(x) := \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_1^j,\, y \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}_j}\mathbf{u}_j(z)} \mathbf{G}_j(x, y, \mathbf{H}_j(z, y, \mathbf{u}_j(z)))$$

and

$$\mathbf{w}_j(x) := \sup_{z \in \mathcal{C}_1^j,\, p \in \partial^- \mathbf{w}_j(z)} \mathbf{w}_j(z) + p \cdot (x - z).$$

Since $\partial_{\mathbf{G}_j}\mathbf{u}_j(\mathcal{C}_1^j) \subset B_K$ by assumption, we see that $\partial_{\mathbf{G}_j}\mathbf{u}_j(B_K) \subset B_K$. Furthermore, $\int_{\mathcal{C}_1^j} f_j = \int_{\mathcal{C}_2^j} g_j$ because $(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}_j})_{\#}f_j = g_j$, from which, using (4.2), it follows that

$$\rho_j = (|\mathcal{C}_1^j|/|\mathcal{C}_2^j|)^{1/n} \to 1$$

as $j \to \infty$. So, $\partial^-\mathbf{w}_j(B_K) \subset B_{\rho_j K} \subset B_{2K}$ for $j \gg 1$. Using (4.3), we determine that the collections $\mathbf{u}_j$ and $\mathbf{w}_j$ are locally uniformly Lipschitz (see Section 2.1). Thus, up to a subsequence (recall the equality in (4.5)), $\mathbf{u}_j$ and $\mathbf{w}_j$ converge locally uniformly (in B_K) to $\mathbf{u}_\infty$ and $\mathbf{w}_\infty$ respectively. Moreover,

$$\mathbf{u}_\infty(0) = \mathbf{w}_\infty(0) = 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|\mathbf{u}_\infty - \mathbf{w}_\infty\|_{C^0(B_{1/K})} \geq \varepsilon_0. \tag{4.6}$$

Clearly, f_j and g_j converge weakly* in L^∞ to densities f_∞ and g_∞ respectively both supported in $\overline{B}_K$. Similarly, recalling that $\rho_j \to 1$ and using (4.2), $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}_1^j}$ and $\mathbf{1}_{\rho_j\mathcal{C}_2^j}$ converge weakly* in L^∞ to f_∞ and g_∞ respectively. In addition, we notice that $f_\infty \geq \mathbf{1}_{B_{1/K}}$ from (4.2) and as $\mathcal{C}_1^j \supset B_{1/K}$.

By Proposition 2.1, we see that $\nabla\mathbf{u}_\infty$ and $\nabla\mathbf{w}_\infty$ are optimal transport maps for the linear cost $-x \cdot y$ taking f_∞ to g_∞. From the uniqueness of optimal transport maps, we have the $\nabla\mathbf{u}_\infty = \nabla\mathbf{w}_\infty$ almost everywhere in $B_{1/K} \subset \operatorname{spt} f_\infty$. Yet, the equality in (4.6) then implies that $\mathbf{u}_\infty = \mathbf{w}_\infty$, contradicting the inequality in (4.6). □

From this point forward, let $\mathcal{N}_r(E)$ denote the r-neighborhood of a set E.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{w}$ be $\mathbf{G}$-convex and convex functions respectively and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ be a symmetric matrix such that*

$$\frac{1}{K}\operatorname{Id} \leq A \leq K \operatorname{Id} \tag{4.7}$$

for some $K \geq 1$. Define the ellipsoid

$$\mathcal{E}(x_0, h) := \{x : A(x - x_0) \cdot (x - x_0) \leq h\},$$

and let $H(x_0,h)$ be the image of $\mathcal{E}(x_0,h)\times\partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(\mathcal{E}(x_0,h))\times\mathbf{u}(\mathcal{E}(x_0,h))$ under $\mathbf{H}$. If

$$\|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{w}\|_{C^0(\mathcal{E}(x_0,h))}\leq\varepsilon\qquad\text{and}\qquad\|\mathbf{G}-x\cdot y+v\|_{C^2(\mathcal{E}(x_0,h)\times\partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(\mathcal{E}(x_0,h))\times H(x_0,h))}\leq\delta$$

for small constants $\varepsilon,\delta>0$, then

$$\partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(\mathcal{E}(x_0,h-\sqrt{\varepsilon}))\subset\mathcal{N}_{K'(\delta+\sqrt{h\varepsilon})}(\partial^-\mathbf{w}(\mathcal{E}(x_0,h)))\quad\forall 0<\varepsilon<h^2\leq 1$$

where K' depends only on K.

Proof. Up a change of variables, we can assume that $x_0=0$, and for simplicity, let $\mathcal{E}_h:=\mathcal{E}(0,h)$. Now, define

$$\bar{\mathbf{w}}(x):=\mathbf{w}(x)+\varepsilon+2\sqrt{\varepsilon}(Ax\cdot x-h).$$

By construction, $\bar{\mathbf{w}}\geq\mathbf{u}$ outside $\mathcal{E}_h$ and $\bar{\mathbf{w}}\leq\mathbf{u}$ inside $\mathcal{E}_{h-\sqrt{\varepsilon}}$. Therefore, if $\mathscr{G}_{x,y,v}$ is a $\mathbf{G}$-support for $\mathbf{u}$ at $x\in\mathcal{E}_{h-\sqrt{\varepsilon}}$, then $\mathscr{G}_{x,y,\bar{v}}$ will be a $\mathbf{G}$-support for $\bar{\mathbf{w}}$ for some $\bar{v}\geq v$ at a point $\bar{x}\in\mathcal{E}_h$. Hence,

$$\partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(\mathcal{E}_{h-\sqrt{\varepsilon}})\subset\partial_{\mathbf{G}}\bar{\mathbf{w}}(\mathcal{E}_h).^4$$

From (4.7), we determine that $\operatorname{diam}(\mathcal{E}_h)\leq 2\sqrt{Kh}$. So, using (4.7) again, it follows that

$$\partial^-\bar{\mathbf{w}}(\mathcal{E}_h)\subset\mathcal{N}_{4K\sqrt{Kh\varepsilon}}(\partial^-\mathbf{w}(\mathcal{E}_h)).$$

As $\partial_{\mathbf{G}}\bar{\mathbf{w}}(x)\subset\mathbf{G}\text{-}\exp_{x,\bar{\mathbf{w}}(x)}(\partial^-\bar{\mathbf{w}}(x))$ for all $x\in\mathcal{E}_h$ and $\|\mathbf{G}\text{-}\exp-\operatorname{Id}\|_{L^\infty}\leq\delta$ (by assumption), we find that

$$\partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(\mathcal{E}_{h-\sqrt{\varepsilon}})\subset\mathcal{N}_{K'(\delta+\sqrt{h\varepsilon})}(\partial^-\mathbf{w}(\mathcal{E}_h))$$

with $K'=4K\sqrt{K}$, as desired. □

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ be two closed sets such that*

$$B_{1/3}\subset\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2\subset B_3,\tag{4.8}$$

f and g be two densities supported on $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ respectively, and $\mathbf{u}:B_3\to\mathbb{R}$ be a $\mathbf{G}$-convex function such that $\partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(\mathcal{C}_1)\subset B_3$ and $(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}})_\#f=g$. For every $\beta\in(0,1)$, there exist constants $\delta_0,\eta_0\in(0,1)$ such that the follow holds: if

$$\|f-\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}_1}\|_{L^\infty}+\|g-\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}_2}\|_{L^\infty}\leq\delta_0,\tag{4.9}$$

$$\|\mathbf{G}-x\cdot y+v\|_{C^2(\mathcal{B}_3)}+\|\mathbf{H}-x\cdot y+u\|_{C^2(\mathcal{B}_3)}\leq\delta_0,\tag{4.10}$$

and

$$\left\|\mathbf{u}-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2\right\|_{C^0(B_3)}\leq\eta_0,\tag{4.11}$$

then $\mathbf{u}\in C^{1,\beta}(B_{1/7})$.

Proof. We break the proof up into several steps.

– *Step 1: $\mathbf{u}$ is close to a strictly convex solution of the Monge-Ampère equation.*

Let $\mathbf{w}:X\to\mathbb{R}$ be a convex function such that $(\nabla\mathbf{w})_\#\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}_1}=\mathbf{1}_{\rho\mathcal{C}_2}$ with $\rho=(|\mathcal{C}_1|/|\mathcal{C}_2|)^{1/n}$. Up to adding a constant to $\mathbf{w}$, we can assume that $\mathbf{w}(0)=\mathbf{u}(0)$. So, from Lemma 4.1, we find that

$$\|\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{w}\|_{C^0(B_{1/3})}\leq\omega(\delta_0)\tag{4.12}$$

for some universal modulus of continuity $\omega:\mathbb{R}^+\to\mathbb{R}^+$. Combining (4.11) and (4.12), it then follows that

$$\left\|\mathbf{w}-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2\right\|_{C^0(B_3)}\leq\omega(\delta_0)+\eta_0.$$

[4] Even though $\bar{\mathbf{w}}$ may not be $\mathbf{G}$-convex, we can still consider its $\mathbf{G}$-subdifferential; it just might be empty at some points. In particular, the inclusion $\partial_{\mathbf{G}}\bar{\mathbf{w}}(x)\subset\mathbf{G}\text{-}\exp_{x,\bar{\mathbf{w}}(x)}(\partial^-\bar{\mathbf{w}}(x))$ still holds.

Since $\int_{\mathcal{C}_1} f = \int_{\mathcal{C}_2} g$, (4.9) implies that $|\rho - 1| \leq 3\delta_0$ provided δ_0 is sufficiently small (universally so). Therefore, recalling that $\mathbf{w}$ is convex and $B_{1/3} \subset \mathcal{C}_2$ ((4.8)), we see that

$$\partial^- \mathbf{w}(B_{1/4}) \subset B_{7/24} \subset (1 - 3\delta_0)B_{1/3} \subset \rho\mathcal{C}_2$$

if δ_0 and η_0 are sufficiently and universally small. Thus, applying [5, Proposition 3.4], we deduce that $\mathbf{w}$ is a strictly convex Alexandrov solution to the Monge-Ampère equation

$$\det D^2\mathbf{w} = 1 \quad \text{in } B_{1/4}. \tag{4.13}$$

By classical Pogorelov and Schauder estimates and an easy computation ([4, Theorem 3.3.2 and Remark 1.1]), there exists a universal constant $K_0 \geq 1$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_{C^3(B_{1/5})} \leq K_0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{1}{K_0}\,\mathrm{Id} \leq D^2\mathbf{w} \leq K_0\,\mathrm{Id} \quad \text{in } B_{1/5}. \tag{4.14}$$

Moreover, a simple compactness argument shows that $\mathbf{w}$ has a universal modulus of strict convexity inside $B_{1/4}$; there exists a universal height $\bar{h} > 0$ such that

$$S(x, \mathbf{w}, h) := \{z : \mathbf{w}(z) \leq \mathbf{w}(x) + \nabla\mathbf{w}(x) \cdot (z - x) + h\} \Subset B_{1/6} \quad \forall h \leq \bar{h}$$

for all $x \in B_{1/7}$. (See, e.g., [4, Section 4.2].)

– *Step 2:* $\mathbf{G}$*-sections of* $\mathbf{u}$ *are close to sections of* $\mathbf{w}$*.*

For $x \in B_3$ and $y \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(x)$, define

$$S_{\mathbf{G}}(x, y, \mathbf{u}, h) := \{z : \mathbf{u}(z) \leq \mathbf{G}(z, y, v) + h\},$$

with $v := \mathbf{H}(x, y, \mathbf{u}(x))$. We claim that if δ_0 is sufficiently small, then for all $x \in B_{1/7}$, $y \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(x)$, and $h \leq \bar{h}/2$,

$$S(x, \mathbf{w}, h - K_1\sqrt{\omega(\delta_0)}) \subset S_{\mathbf{G}}(x, y, \mathbf{u}, h) \subset S(x, \mathbf{w}, h + K_1\sqrt{\omega(\delta_0)}) \Subset B_{1/6} \tag{4.15}$$

where $K_1 > 0$ is a universal constant.

First, let δ_0 be sufficiently small and $h \leq \bar{h}/2$ so that the last incusion holds from Step 1.

Now, for $x \in B_{1/7}$ and $y \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(x)$, define

$$p_x := D_x\mathbf{G}(x, y, v) \in \partial^-\mathbf{u}(x).$$

(Recall (2.4).) By (4.14) and as $\mathbf{u}$ is semi-convex with a universal semi-convexity constant, we have that $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}$ is universally semi-convex; so,

$$|p_x - \nabla\mathbf{w}(x)| \leq \bar{K}\sqrt{\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}\|_{C^0(B_{1/5})}} \leq \bar{K}\sqrt{\omega(\delta_0)} \quad \forall x \in B_{1/6}. \tag{4.16}$$

From (4.10), we determine that

$$|p_x - y| \leq \|D_x\mathbf{G} - \mathrm{Id}\,\|_{C^0(\mathcal{B}_3)} \leq \delta_0, \tag{4.17}$$

from which we see (again using (4.10)) that

$$|\mathbf{G}(z, y, v) - z \cdot p_x + v| \leq 2\delta_0 \quad \forall x \in B_{1/7}, z \in B_3 \tag{4.18}$$

and

$$|\mathbf{H}(z, y, u) - z \cdot p_x + u| \leq 2\delta_0 \quad \forall x \in B_{1/7}, z \in B_3 \tag{4.19}$$

where $u := \mathbf{u}(x)$. Hence, let $z \in S(x, \mathbf{w}, h - K_1\sqrt{\omega(\delta_0)})$. Then, by (4.12), (4.16), (4.18), and (4.19), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{u}(z) &\leq \mathbf{w}(x) + \nabla\mathbf{w}(x) \cdot (z - x) + h - K_1\sqrt{\omega(\delta_0)} + \omega(\delta_0) \\
&\leq \mathbf{u}(x) - x \cdot p_x + \mathbf{H}(x, y, u) + z \cdot p_x - v + h - K_1\sqrt{\omega(\delta_0)} + 2\omega(\delta_0) + 2\bar{K}\sqrt{\omega(\delta_0)} \\
&\leq \mathbf{G}(z, y, v) + h - K_1\sqrt{\omega(\delta_0)} + 2\omega(\delta_0) + 2\bar{K}\sqrt{\omega(\delta_0)} + 4\delta_0 \\
&\leq \mathbf{G}(z, y, v) + h
\end{aligned}$$

provided that $K_1 > 0$ is sufficiently large. This proves the first inclusion; the proof of the second is analogous.

– Step 3: The $\mathbf{G}$*-sections of* $\mathbf{u}$ *and their images under* $\partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}$ *are close to ellipsoids with controlled eccentricity, and* $\mathbf{u}$ *is close to a smooth function.*

We claim that there exists a universal constant $K_2 \geq 1$ such that the following holds: for every small $\eta_0 > 0$, there exist constants $h_0 = h_0(\eta_0) > 0$ and $\delta_0 = \delta_0(h_0, \eta_0) > 0$ such that if $x_0 \in B_{1/7}$, then there exists a symmetric matrix satisfying

$$\frac{1}{K_2}\,\mathrm{Id} \leq A \leq K_2\,\mathrm{Id}, \tag{4.20}$$

$$\det(A) = 1, \tag{4.21}$$

$$A\Big(B_{\sqrt{h_0/8}}(x_0)\Big) \subset S_{\mathbf{G}}(x_0, y_0, \mathbf{u}, h_0) \subset A\Big(B_{\sqrt{8h_0}}(x_0)\Big), \tag{4.22}$$

and

$$A^{-1}\Big(B_{\sqrt{h_0/8}}(y_0)\Big) \subset \partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(S_{\mathbf{G}}(x_0, y_0, \mathbf{u}, h_0)) \subset A^{-1}\Big(B_{\sqrt{8h_0}}(y_0)\Big) \tag{4.23}$$

for all $y_0 \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(x_0)$. Moreover,

$$\left\|\mathbf{u} - \mathscr{G}_{x_0,y_0,v_0} - \frac{1}{2}|A^{-1}(x - x_0)|^2\right\|_{C^0\left(A\left(B_{\sqrt{8h_0}}(x_0)\right)\right)} \leq \eta_0 h_0, \tag{4.24}$$

where $\mathscr{G}_{x_0,y_0,v_0}$ is a $\mathbf{G}$-support for $\mathbf{u}$ at x_0.

Let $h_0 \ll \bar{h}$ (to be fixed) and apply Step 2 with $h = h_0$ and δ_0 sufficiently small so that $K_1\sqrt{\omega(\delta_0)} \leq h_0/4$. Thus,

$$S(x_0, \mathbf{w}, 3h_0/4) \subset S_{\mathbf{G}}(x_0, y_0, \mathbf{u}, h_0) \subset S(x_0, \mathbf{w}, 5h_0/4) \Subset B_{1/6}. \tag{4.25}$$

By (4.14), we see that

$$\mathbf{w}(x) = \mathbf{w}(x_0) + \nabla\mathbf{w}(x_0)\cdot(x - x_0) + \frac{1}{2}D^2\mathbf{w}(x_0)(x - x_0)\cdot(x - x_0) + O(|x - x_0|^3). \tag{4.26}$$

Hence, defining

$$\mathcal{E}(x_0, h) := \left\{x : \frac{1}{2}D^2\mathbf{w}(x_0)(x - x_0)\cdot(x - x_0) \leq h\right\}$$

and using (4.14) and (4.26), we deduce that for every h_0 sufficiently (universally) small,

$$\mathcal{E}(x_0, 4h_0/5) \subset S(x_0, \mathbf{w}, h_0) \subset \mathcal{E}(x_0, 6h_0/5). \tag{4.27}$$

Combining (4.25) and (4.27), we have that

$$\mathcal{E}(x_0, 3h_0/5) \subset S_{\mathbf{G}}(x_0, y_0, \mathbf{u}, h_0) \subset \mathcal{E}(x_0, 3h_0/2). \tag{4.28}$$

In turn, letting

$$A := [D^2\mathbf{w}(x_0)]^{-1/2}, \tag{4.29}$$

we see that (4.22) holds. In addition, using (4.13) and (4.14), we see that (4.21) and (4.20) hold.

Now, let us show (4.23) with A, as defined in (4.29). Observe that thanks to (4.26) and the uniform convexity of $\mathbf{w}$, for all h sufficiently small,

$$\nabla\mathbf{w}(\mathcal{E}(x_0, h)) \subset \mathcal{E}^*(\nabla\mathbf{w}(x_0), 3h/2) \subset \nabla\mathbf{w}(\mathcal{E}(x_0, 2h)) \tag{4.30}$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}^*(\bar{y}, h) := \left\{y : \frac{1}{2}[D^2\mathbf{w}(\bar{y})]^{-1}(y - \bar{y})\cdot(y - \bar{y}) \leq h\right\}.$$

By (4.28) and then Lemma 4.2 with $h = 3h_0/2 + \sqrt{\omega(\delta_0)}$ and (4.30), we determine that

$$\partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(S_{\mathbf{G}}(x_0, y_0, \mathbf{u}, h_0)) \subset \mathcal{N}_{K''\sqrt{\omega(\delta_0)}}(\nabla\mathbf{w}(\mathcal{E}(x_0, 2h_0))) \subset \mathcal{E}^*(\nabla\mathbf{w}(x_0), 7h_0/2) \tag{4.31}$$

for $\delta_0 \ll h_0 \ll \bar{h}$. In addition, by (4.16), if $y_0 \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(x_0)$ and we set $p_{x_0} := D_x\mathbf{G}(x_0, y_0, v_0)$, then

$$|y_0 - \nabla\mathbf{w}(x_0)| \leq \|\operatorname{Id} - D_x\mathbf{G}(x_0, y_0, v_0)\| + |p_{x_0} - \nabla\mathbf{w}(x_0)| \leq \delta_0 + \bar{K}\sqrt{\omega(\delta_0)}.$$

And so, choosing δ_0 sufficiently small, we find that

$$\mathcal{E}^*(\nabla\mathbf{w}(x_0), 7h_0/2) \subset \mathcal{E}^*(y_0, 4h_0),$$

which combined with (4.31) yields

$$\partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(S_{\mathbf{G}}(x_0, y_0, \mathbf{u}, h_0)) \subset \mathcal{E}^*(y_0, 4h_0). \tag{4.32}$$

In order to conclude, we must show that

$$\mathcal{E}^*(y_0, h_0/16) \subset \partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(S_{\mathbf{G}}(x_0, y_0, \mathbf{u}, h_0)).$$

Arguing as we did to show (4.32), we deduce that

$$\mathcal{E}^*(y_0, h_0/16) \subset \mathcal{E}^*(\nabla\mathbf{w}(x_0), h_0/15)$$

if δ_0 is small enough; hence, is suffices to show that

$$\mathcal{E}^*(\nabla\mathbf{w}(x_0), h_0/15) \subset \partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(S_{\mathbf{G}}(x_0, y_0, \mathbf{u}, h_0)).$$

To do this, we consider the $\mathbf{G}$-transform of $\mathbf{u}$ and the Legendre transform of $\mathbf{w}$. Specifically,

$$\mathbf{v}(y) := \sup_{x \in B_{1/5}} \mathbf{H}(x, y, \mathbf{u}(x)) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbf{w}^*(y) := \sup_{x \in B_{1/5}} \{x \cdot y - \mathbf{w}(x)\}.$$

Notice that

$$\|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}^*\|_{C^0(B_3)} \leq \omega(\delta_0) + \delta_0 \leq 2\omega(\delta_0),$$

and from (4.14), $\mathbf{w}^*$ is uniformly convex and of class C^3 in the open set $\nabla\mathbf{w}(B_{1/5})$. Now, since

$$E \subset \partial_{\mathbf{G}}(\partial_{\mathbf{H}}\mathbf{v}(E)) \quad \forall E,$$

if we consider (4.28), then we see that it suffices to show

$$\partial_{\mathbf{H}}\mathbf{v}(\mathcal{E}^*(\nabla\mathbf{w}(x_0), h_0/15)) \subset \mathcal{E}(x_0, 3h_0/5).$$

Applying Lemma 4.2 to $\mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{w}^*$, provided that δ_0 is small enough, we determine that

$$\partial_{\mathbf{H}}\mathbf{v}(\mathcal{E}^*(\nabla\mathbf{w}(x_0), h_0/15)) \subset \mathcal{N}_{K'''\sqrt{\omega(\delta_0)}}(\nabla\mathbf{w}^*(\mathcal{E}^*(\nabla\mathbf{w}(x_0), h_0/5))) \subset \mathcal{E}(x_0, 3h_0/5)$$

Here, we have used

$$\nabla\mathbf{w}^* = [\nabla\mathbf{w}]^{-1} \qquad \text{and} \qquad D^2\mathbf{w}^*(\nabla\mathbf{w}(x_0)) = [D^2\mathbf{w}(x_0)]^{-1}$$

and (4.30) but with $\mathbf{w}$ rather than $\mathbf{w}^*$ for the second inclusion. Thus, (4.23) holds, as desired.

Finally, using (4.26), (4.20), (4.16), (4.10), (4.12), and (4.17), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\mathbf{u} - \mathscr{G}_{x_0,y_0,v_0} - \frac{1}{2}D^2\mathbf{w}(x_0)(x - x_0)\cdot(x - x_0)\right\|_{C^0(\mathcal{E}(x_0,4h_0))} \\
&\quad\leq \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{w}(x_0) + \nabla\mathbf{w}(x_0)\cdot(x - x_0) - \mathscr{G}_{x_0,y_0,v_0}\|_{C^0(\mathcal{E}(x_0,4h_0))} + K(K_2\sqrt{8h_0})^3 \\
&\quad\leq \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{w}(x_0) + p_{x_0}\cdot(x - x_0) - \mathscr{G}_{x_0,y_0,v_0}\|_{C^0(\mathcal{E}(x_0,4h_0))} + \bar{K}\sqrt{\omega(\delta_0)} + K(K_2\sqrt{8h_0})^3 \\
&\quad\leq \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{w}(x_0) + p_{x_0}\cdot(x - x_0) + \mathbf{H}(x_0, y_0, u_0) - x\cdot y_0\|_{C^0(\mathcal{E}(x_0,4h_0))} \\
&\qquad\quad + \delta_0 + \bar{K}\sqrt{\omega(\delta_0)} + K(K_2\sqrt{8h_0})^3 \\
&\quad\leq \|(p_{x_0} - y_0)\cdot(x - x_0)\|_{C^0(\mathcal{E}(x_0,4h_0))} + 2\omega(\delta_0) + 2\delta_0 + \bar{K}\sqrt{\omega(\delta_0)} + K(K_2\sqrt{8h_0})^3 \\
&\quad\leq 2\omega(\delta_0) + 3\delta_0 + \bar{K}\sqrt{\omega(\delta_0)} + K(K_2\sqrt{8h_0})^3 \\
&\quad\leq \eta_0 h_0
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows after first choosing h_0 sufficiently small and then choosing δ_0 even smaller.

– *Step 4: A first change of variables.*

Fix $x_0 \in B_{1/7}$ and $y_0 \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(x_0)$, let

$$M := \mathbf{E}(x_0, y_0, v_0) \qquad \text{and} \qquad a := -D_v\mathbf{G}(x_0, y_0, v_0),$$

where $\mathbf{E}$ is as defined in (2.11) and, as usual, $u_0 := \mathbf{u}(x_0)$ and $v_0 := \mathbf{H}(x_0, y_0, u_0)$, and consider the change of variables

$$\hat{x} := x - x_0, \qquad \hat{y} := M^{-1}(y - y_0), \qquad \hat{v} := a^{-1}v, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \hat{u} := au$$

Observe that (4.10) implies that

$$|a - 1|, |M - \mathrm{Id}\,| \leq \delta_0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad |a^{-1} - 1|, |M^{-1} - \mathrm{Id}\,| \leq 2\delta_0 \tag{4.33}$$

for δ_0 sufficiently small. Furthermore, define

$$\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{v}) := \mathbf{G}(x, y, v + \mathbf{H}(x_0, y, u_0)) - \mathbf{G}(x, y_0, v_0)$$

and

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}}(\hat{x}) := \mathbf{u}(x) - \mathbf{G}(x, y_0, v_0).$$

Clearly, $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ is $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$-convex, and the $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$-transform of $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ is given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}}(\hat{y}) := \mathbf{v}(y) - \mathbf{H}(x_0, y, u_0).$$

A simple computation shows that

$$\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\cdot, 0, 0) = \hat{\mathbf{G}}(0, \cdot, 0) \equiv 0, \qquad D_{\hat{x}\hat{y}}\hat{\mathbf{G}}(0, 0, 0) = \mathrm{Id}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad D_{\hat{v}}\hat{\mathbf{G}}(0, 0, 0) = -1. \tag{4.34}$$

In addition, notice that

$$\partial_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}}\hat{\mathbf{u}}(\hat{x}) = M^{-1}(\partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(\hat{x} + x_0) - y_0). \tag{4.35}$$

Thus, using (4.33) and (4.35), we find that (4.22) and (4.23) become

$$A(B_{\sqrt{h_0}/3}) \subset S_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}}(0, 0, \hat{\mathbf{u}}, h_0) \subset A(B_{3\sqrt{h_0}}) \tag{4.36}$$

and

$$A^{-1}(B_{\sqrt{h_0}/3}) \subset \partial_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}}\hat{\mathbf{u}}(S_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}}(0, 0, \hat{\mathbf{u}}, h_0)) \subset A^{-1}(B_{3\sqrt{h_0}}). \tag{4.37}$$

Since $(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}})_{\#}f = g$, we have that $(\mathbf{T}_{\hat{\mathbf{u}}})_{\#}\hat{f} = \hat{g}$ with

$$\hat{f}(\hat{x}) := f(\hat{x} + x_0) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \hat{g}(\hat{y}) := \det(M)g(M\hat{y} + y_0).$$

Moreover, from (4.33), we see that $|\det(M) - 1| \leq (1 + 2n)\delta_0$, for δ_0 small. And so, by (4.9), we determine that

$$\|\hat{f} - \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}_1 - x_0}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\hat{g} - \mathbf{1}_{M^{-1}(\mathcal{C}_2 - y_0)}\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2(1 + n)\delta_0. \tag{4.38}$$

– *Step 5: A second change of variables and an iterative construction.*

Set

$$\tilde{x} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{h_0}}A^{-1}\hat{x}, \qquad \tilde{y} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{h_0}}A\hat{y}, \qquad \tilde{v} := \frac{1}{h_0}\hat{v}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \tilde{u} := \frac{1}{h_0}\hat{u}$$

and define

$$\mathbf{G}_1(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{v}) := \frac{\hat{\mathbf{G}}(\sqrt{h_0}A\tilde{x}, \sqrt{h_0}A^{-1}\tilde{y}, h_0\tilde{v})}{h_0} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbf{u}_1(\tilde{x}) := \frac{\hat{\mathbf{u}}(\sqrt{h_0}A\tilde{x})}{h_0}.$$

Similarly, let

$$\mathbf{H}_1(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{u}) := \frac{\hat{\mathbf{H}}(\sqrt{h_0}A\tilde{x}, \sqrt{h_0}A^{-1}\tilde{y}, h_0\tilde{u})}{h_0} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbf{v}_1(\tilde{y}) := \frac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}(\sqrt{h_0}A^{-1}\tilde{y})}{h_0}.$$

A simple consequence of (4.34) and (4.10) is that

$$\|\mathbf{G}_1 - \tilde{x} \cdot \tilde{y} + \tilde{v}\|_{C^0(\mathcal{B}_3)} + \|\mathbf{H}_1 - \tilde{x} \cdot \tilde{y} + \tilde{u}\|_{C^0(\mathcal{B}_3)} \leq 4\delta_0.$$

In addition, setting

$$\mathcal{C}_1^1 := S_{\mathbf{G}_1}(0,0,\mathbf{u}_1,1) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{C}_2^1 := \partial_{\mathbf{G}_1}\mathbf{u}_1(S_{\mathbf{G}_1}(0,0,\mathbf{u}_1,1)),$$

thanks to (4.36) and (4.37), we have the inclusions

$$B_{1/3} \subset \mathcal{C}_1^1, \mathcal{C}_2^1 \subset B_3. \tag{4.39}$$

Furthermore, rewriting (4.24) yields

$$\left\| \mathbf{u}_1 - \frac{1}{2}|\tilde{x}|^2 \right\|_{C^0(B_3)} \leq \eta_0.$$

Now, let

$$f_1(\tilde{x}) := \hat{f}(\sqrt{h_0}A\tilde{x})\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}_1^1} \qquad \text{and} \qquad g_1(\tilde{y}) := \hat{g}(\sqrt{h_0}A^{-1}\tilde{y})\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}_2^1}.$$

Recalling that $\det(A) = 1$ and arguing as in the proof of Theorem 1.3, we determine that

$$(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}_1})_\# f_1 = g_1.$$

Finally, using the inequality $\sqrt{h_0}(\|A\| + \|A^{-1}\|) \ll 1$ and (4.38), it follows that

$$\|f_1 - \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}_1^1}\|_{L^\infty} + \|g_1 - \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}_2^1}\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2(1+n)\delta_0.$$

Hence, $\mathbf{u}_1$ satisfies the same assumptions as $\mathbf{u}$ with δ_0 replaced by $2(1+n)\delta_0$. After decreasing δ_0, we can apply Step 3 to $\mathbf{u}_1$ and find a symmetric matrix A_1 such that

$$\frac{1}{K_2}\,\mathrm{Id} \leq A_1 \leq K_2\,\mathrm{Id},$$

$$\det(A_1) = 1,$$

$$A_1\Big(B_{\sqrt{h_0/8}}\Big) \subset S_{\mathbf{G}_1}(0,0,\mathbf{u}_1,h_0) \subset A_1\Big(B_{\sqrt{8h_0}}\Big),$$

$$A_1^{-1}\Big(B_{\sqrt{h_0/8}}\Big) \subset \partial_{\mathbf{G}_1}\mathbf{u}(S_{\mathbf{G}_1}(0,0,\mathbf{u}_1,h_0)) \subset A_1^{-1}\Big(B_{\sqrt{8h_0}}\Big),$$

and

$$\left\| \mathbf{u}_1 - \frac{1}{2}|A_1^{-1}\tilde{x}|^2 \right\|_{C\left(A_1\left(B_{\sqrt{8h_0}}\right)\right)} \leq \eta_0 h_0.$$

(The constants K_2 and h_0 are those from Step 3).

Now, consider

$$\mathbf{G}_2(\tilde{x},\tilde{y},\tilde{v}) := \frac{\mathbf{G}_1(\sqrt{h_0}A_1\tilde{x}, \sqrt{h_0}A_1^{-1}\tilde{y}, h_0\tilde{v})}{h_0} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbf{u}_2(\tilde{x}) := \frac{\mathbf{u}_1(\sqrt{h_0}A_1\tilde{x})}{h_0}.$$

Also, set

$$\mathbf{H}_2(\tilde{x},\tilde{y},\tilde{u}) := \frac{\mathbf{H}_1(\sqrt{h_0}A_1\tilde{x}, \sqrt{h_0}A_1^{-1}\tilde{y}, h_0\tilde{u})}{h_0} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbf{v}_2(\tilde{x}) := \frac{\mathbf{v}_1(\sqrt{h_0}A_1^{-1}\tilde{y})}{h_0}.$$

Arguing as before, we see that $(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}_2})_\# f_2 = g_2$ where

$$f_2(\tilde{x}) := f_1(\sqrt{h_0}A_1\tilde{x})\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}_1^2} \qquad \text{with} \qquad \mathcal{C}_1^2 := S_{\mathbf{G}_2}(0,0,\mathbf{u}_2,1)$$

and

$$g_2(\tilde{y}) := g_1(\sqrt{h_0}A_1^{-1}\tilde{y})\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}_2^2} \qquad \text{with} \qquad \mathcal{C}_2^2 := \partial_{\mathbf{G}_2}\mathbf{u}_2(S_{\mathbf{G}_2}(0,0,\mathbf{u}_2,1)).$$

Moreover, we find that $\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{G}_2, \mathbf{H}_2, \mathcal{C}_1^2, \mathcal{C}_2^2, f_2$, and g_2 have the same properties as $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{G}_1, \mathbf{H}_1, \mathcal{C}_1^1, \mathcal{C}_2^1, f_1$, and g_1. Thus, we can continue, iteratively constructing, in particular,

$$\mathbf{G}_{k+1}(\tilde{x},\tilde{y},\tilde{v}) := \frac{\mathbf{G}_k(\sqrt{h_0}A_k\tilde{x}, \sqrt{h_0}A_k^{-1}\tilde{y}, h_0\tilde{v})}{h_0} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbf{u}_{k+1}(\tilde{x}) := \frac{\mathbf{u}_k(\sqrt{h_0}A_k\tilde{x})}{h_0}$$

where A_k is the symmetric matrix constructed in the the k-th iteration. In turn, setting

$$M_k := A_k \cdot \ldots \cdot A_1,$$

we have a sequence of symmetric matrices such that

$$\frac{1}{K_2^k}\,\mathrm{Id} \leq M_k \leq K_2^k\,\mathrm{Id}, \tag{4.40}$$

$$\det(M_k) = 1,$$

and

$$M_k\Big(B_{(h_0/8)^{k/2}}\Big) \subset S_{\mathbf{G}_k}(0,0,\mathbf{u}_k,h_0^k) \subset M_k\Big(B_{(8h_0)^{k/2}}\Big). \tag{4.41}$$

– *Step 6: $C^{1,\beta}$-regularity.*

Let $\beta \in (0,1)$. By (4.40) and (4.41), we determine that

$$B_{(\sqrt{h_0}/(K_2\sqrt{8}))^k} \subset S_{\mathbf{G}_1}(0,0,\mathbf{u}_1,h_0^k) \subset B_{(K_2\sqrt{8h_0})^k}. \tag{4.42}$$

Defining $r_0 := \sqrt{h_0}/(K_2\sqrt{8})$ and recalling that $\mathbf{G}_1(\cdot,0,0) \equiv 0$, it follows that

$$\|\mathbf{u}_1\|_{C^0(B_{r_0^k})} \leq h_0^k = (\sqrt{8}K_2 r_0)^{2k} \leq r_0^{(1+\beta)k}$$

provided that h_0 (and so, r_0) is sufficiently small. In other words, $\mathbf{u}_1$ is $C^{1,\beta}$ at 0, from which we deduce that $\mathbf{u}$ is $C^{1,\beta}$ at x_0 with universal bounds for all $x_0 \in B_{1/7}$. Hence, $\mathbf{u} \in C^{1,\beta}(B_{1/7})$, as desired. □

Corollary 4.4. *Let $\mathbf{u}$ be as in Theorem 4.3. Then, $\mathbf{u}$ is strictly $\mathbf{G}$-convex in $B_{1/7}$. More precisely, for every $\gamma > 2$, there exist constants $\eta_0, \delta_0 > 0$, depending only on γ, such that for all $x_0 \in B_{1/7}$, $y_0 \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}}(x_0)$, and $\mathscr{G}_{x_0,y_0,v_0}$, we have that*

$$\inf_{\partial B_r(x_0)} \{\mathbf{u} - \mathscr{G}_{x_0,y_0,v_0}\} \geq c_0 r^\gamma \quad \forall r \leq \mathrm{dist}(x_0, \partial B_{1/7}) \tag{4.43}$$

for some universal constant $c_0 > 0$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{u}_1$ be as in Theorem 4.3 (see Step 5) and set $\rho_0 := K_2\sqrt{8h_0}$. Then, from (4.42) and recalling that $\mathbf{G}_1(\cdot,0,0) \equiv 0$, we deduce that

$$\inf_{\partial B_{\rho_0^k}} \mathbf{u}_1 \geq h_0^k = (\rho_0/(K_2\sqrt{8}))^{2k} \geq \rho_0^{\gamma k}$$

if h_0 is sufficiently small, which, in terms of $\mathbf{u}$, yields (4.43). □

A corollary of the strict $\mathbf{G}$-convexity of $\mathbf{u}$ in $B_{1/7}$ is the following:

Corollary 4.5. *Let $\mathbf{u}$ be as in Theorem 4.3. Then, $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}}(B_{1/7})$ is open.*

Proof. Since $\mathbf{u}$ is differentiable in $B_{1/7}$, we have that $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}}(B_{1/7}) = \partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(B_{1/7})$. We show that for each $y_0 = \partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(x_0)$ with $x_0 \in B_{1/7}$, there exists an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that the map

$$z \mapsto \mathbf{H}(z,y,\mathbf{u}(z)) \quad \forall y \in B_{\varepsilon_0}(y_0)$$

has a local maximum at some point $x \in B_{1/7}$. If so,

$$\nabla\mathbf{u}(x) = D_x\mathbf{G}(x,y,\mathbf{H}(x,y,\mathbf{u}(x))),$$

that is, $y \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(x)$ and $B_{\varepsilon_0}(y_0) \subset \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}}(B_{1/7})$, as desired. (See Section 2.1.)

To this end, let $r > 0$ be such that $B_r(x_0) \subset B_{1/7}$,

$$x \in \operatorname*{argmax}_{z \in \overline{B}_r(x_0)} \mathbf{H}(z,y,\mathbf{u}(z)),$$

and $\mathcal{C} := \overline{B}_{1/7} \times \overline{\mathbf{T_u}(B_{1/7})} \times \overline{\mathbf{H}(B_{1/7} \times \mathbf{T_u}(B_{1/7}) \times \mathbf{u}(B_{1/7}))}$. Since $\mathbf{u}(x) = \mathbf{G}(x, y, \mathbf{H}(x, y, \mathbf{u}(x)))$ and $\mathbf{G}$ is decreasing in v, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{u}(x) - \mathscr{G}_{x_0,y_0,v_0}(x) &\le \mathbf{G}(x, y, \mathbf{H}(x_0, y, \mathbf{u}(x_0))) - \mathbf{G}(x, y_0, \mathbf{H}(x_0, y_0, \mathbf{u}(x_0)))\\ &= \mathbf{G}(x, y, \mathbf{H}(x_0, y, \mathbf{u}(x_0))) - \mathbf{G}(x, y_0, \mathbf{H}(x_0, y, \mathbf{u}(x_0)))\\ &\qquad + \mathbf{G}(x, y_0, \mathbf{H}(x_0, y, \mathbf{u}(x_0))) - \mathbf{G}(x, y_0, \mathbf{H}(x_0, y_0, \mathbf{u}(x_0)))\\ &\le \|\mathbf{G}\|_{C^1(\mathcal{C})}(1 + \|\mathbf{H}\|_{C^1(\mathcal{C})})\varepsilon_0.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, taking $\varepsilon_0 < c_0 r^\gamma / K$ with $K = \|\mathbf{G}\|_{C^1(\mathcal{C})}(1 + \|\mathbf{H}\|_{C^1(\mathcal{C})})$, we see that

$$\mathbf{u}(x) - \mathscr{G}_{x_0,y_0,v_0}(x) < c_0 r^\gamma,$$

which, recalling (4.43), implies that $x \in B_r(x_0)$ and not on the boundary. □

5. A Comparison Principle and Higher Regularity

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open and $\mathbf{w} \in C^2(\mathcal{O})$. Assume that $\nabla \mathbf{w}(\mathcal{O}) \subset \operatorname{dom} \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}$ and*

$$D^2\mathbf{w}(x) - D_x^2\mathbf{G}(x, \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{w}(x)}(\nabla \mathbf{w}(x)), \mathbf{H}(x, \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{w}(x)}(\nabla \mathbf{w}(x)), \mathbf{w}(x))) \ge 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{O}.$$

Then, for every Borel set $E \subset \mathcal{O}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&|\mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{w}(x)}(\nabla \mathbf{w}(E))|\\ &\quad \le \int_E \frac{\det(D^2\mathbf{w}(x) - D_x^2\mathbf{G}(x, \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{w}(x)}(\nabla \mathbf{w}(x)), \mathbf{H}(x, \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{w}(x)}(\nabla \mathbf{w}(x)), \mathbf{w}(x))))}{|\det(\mathbf{E}(x, \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{w}(x)}(\nabla \mathbf{w}(x)), \mathbf{H}(x, \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{w}(x)}(\nabla \mathbf{w}(x)), \mathbf{w}(x))))|}\, \mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned}$$

In addition, of the map $x \mapsto \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{w}(x)}(\nabla \mathbf{w}(x))$ is injective, then equality holds.

Proof. After differentiating the identity

$$\nabla \mathbf{w}(x) = D_x\mathbf{G}(x, \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{w}(x)}(\nabla \mathbf{w}(x)), \mathbf{H}(x, \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{w}(x)}(\nabla \mathbf{w}(x)), \mathbf{w}(x))),$$

one can see that the Jacobian determinant of the C^1 map $x \mapsto \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{w}(x)}(\nabla \mathbf{w}(x))$ is the integrand above. Thus, applying the Area Formula (see, e.g., [2]) concludes the proof. □

Let $\operatorname{co}[E]$ denote the convex hull of the set E. Also, recall that $\mathcal{N}_r(E)$ denotes the r-neighborhood of a set E.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $\mathbf{u}$ be a $\mathbf{G}$-convex function of class C^1 in the set $S := \{\mathbf{u} < 1\}$. Assume that $\mathbf{u}(0) = 0$, $B_{1/K} \subset S \subset B_K$, and that $\nabla \mathbf{u}(S) \Subset \operatorname{dom} \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}$. Suppose that f and g are two densities such that*

$$\left\| \frac{f}{\lambda_1} - 1 \right\|_{C^0(S)} + \left\| \frac{g}{\lambda_2} - 1 \right\|_{C^0(\mathbf{T_u}(S))} \le \varepsilon \tag{5.1}$$

for some constants $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in (1/2, 2)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/4)$ and $(\mathbf{T_u})_\# f = g$. Furthmore, assume that

$$\|\mathbf{G} - x \cdot y + v\|_{C^2(\mathcal{B}_K)} \le \delta. \tag{5.2}$$

Then, there exists a universal constant $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and constant $\delta_1 > 0$, depending on K, such that the following holds: if $\mathbf{w}$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \det(D^2\mathbf{w}) = \lambda_1/\lambda_2 & \text{in } \mathcal{N}_{\delta^\gamma}(\operatorname{co}[S])\\ \mathbf{w} = 1 & \text{on } \partial\mathcal{N}_{\delta^\gamma}(\operatorname{co}[S]), \end{cases}$$

then

$$\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{w}\|_{C^0(S)} \le C_K(\varepsilon + \delta^{\gamma/n}) \tag{5.3}$$

provided $\delta \le \delta_1$ and where C_K depends only on K.

Proof. First, notice that

$$\overline{S} = \bigcap_{x\in\partial S, y\in\partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(x)} E_{x,y}$$

where

$$E_{x,y} := \{z \in B_K : \mathbf{G}(z,y,v) \le 1\},$$

$y \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(x)$, and $v := \mathbf{H}(x,y,\mathbf{u}(x))$.[5] Second, as $\mathbf{u}(0) = 0$, $\mathbf{u} = 1$ on ∂S, $S \subset B_K$, and by (5.2), notice that

$$|D_x\mathbf{G}(x,y,v)| \ge c_1 \quad \forall x \in \partial S \tag{5.4}$$

for a universal constant $c_1 > 0$. So, $\partial E_{x,y}$ is of class C^2 in B_K, and its second fundamental form is bounded by $C_K\delta$, for some constant $C_K > 0$ depending only on K. It follows that S is $(C_K\delta)$-semiconvex: for any pair of points $x_0, x_1 \in S$, the ball centered at their midpoint with radius $C_K\delta|x_1 - x_0|^2$ will intersect S. Hence, as $S \subset B_K$, we find that $\mathrm{co}[S] \subset \mathcal{N}_{C_K'\delta}(S)$. In turn, for any $\gamma \in (0,1)$,

$$\mathcal{N}_{\delta^\gamma}(\mathrm{co}[S]) \subset \mathcal{N}_{(1+C_K')\delta^\gamma}(S).$$

Now, as $\mathbf{w} = 1$ on $\partial\mathcal{N}_{\delta^\gamma}(\mathrm{co}[S])$ and $\lambda_1/\lambda_2 \in (1/4, 4)$, it follows that

$$\operatorname*{osc}_S \mathbf{w} \le C_K'', \tag{5.5}$$

$$1 - C_K''\delta^{\gamma/n} \le \mathbf{w} < 1 \quad \text{on } \partial S, \tag{5.6}$$

and

$$D^2\mathbf{w} \ge \frac{\delta^{\gamma/\tau}}{C_K''}\,\mathrm{Id} \quad \text{in } \mathrm{co}[S] \tag{5.7}$$

for some $\tau > 0$ universal (see, e.g., [4]).

Define

$$\mathbf{w}^+ := (1 + 4\varepsilon + 2\sqrt{\delta})\mathbf{w} - 4\varepsilon - 2\sqrt{\delta} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbf{w}^- := (1 - 4\varepsilon - \sqrt{\delta}/2)\mathbf{w} + 4\varepsilon + \sqrt{\delta}/2 + 2C_K''\delta^{\gamma/n}.$$

We claim that if γ is sufficiently and universally small, then $\mathbf{w}^- \ge \mathbf{u} \ge \mathbf{w}^+$ in S. If so, then (5.5) will imply (5.3), as desired.

By (5.6), we have that $\mathbf{w}^- > \mathbf{u} > \mathbf{w}^+$ on ∂S. We first show that $\mathbf{u} \ge \mathbf{w}^+$ in S. Suppose not. Then, as $\mathbf{u} > \mathbf{w}^+$ on ∂S, we see that

$$\emptyset \ne Z := \{\mathbf{u} < \mathbf{w}^+\} \Subset S.$$

Moving any supporting plane to $\mathbf{w}^+$ at $x \in Z$ down and then up until it touches $\mathbf{u}$ ($\mathbf{w}^+$ is convex), we determine that

$$\nabla\mathbf{w}^+(Z) \subset \nabla\mathbf{u}(Z), \tag{5.8}$$

and so,

$$|\mathbf{G}\text{-}\exp(\mathbf{w}^+(Z))| \subset |\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{u}}(Z)|. \tag{5.9}$$

Recall that $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{w}^+$ are C^1 in S. Now, choose $\gamma := \tau/4$. For any $x \in Z$, we compute that

$$\begin{aligned}
D^2\mathbf{w}^+(x) &- D_x^2\mathbf{G}(x, \mathbf{G}\text{-}\exp_{x,\mathbf{w}^+(x)}(\nabla\mathbf{w}^+(x)), \mathbf{H}(x, \mathbf{G}\text{-}\exp_{x,\mathbf{w}^+(x)}(\nabla\mathbf{w}^+(x)), \mathbf{w}^+(x))) \\
&\ge (1 + \sqrt{\delta} + 4\varepsilon)D^2\mathbf{w}(x) + \sqrt{\delta}D^2\mathbf{w}(x) - \delta\,\mathrm{Id} \\
&\ge (1 + \sqrt{\delta} + 4\varepsilon)D^2\mathbf{w}(x) + \left(\frac{\delta^{3/4}}{C_K''} - \delta\right)\mathrm{Id} \\
&\ge (1 + \sqrt{\delta} + 4\varepsilon)D^2\mathbf{w}(x)
\end{aligned}$$

[5] The inclusion $\overline{S} \subset E_{x,y}$ for all $x \in \partial S$ and $y \in \partial_{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{u}(x)$ is trivial. Let $z \notin \overline{S}$ and x be a point such that $\mathrm{dist}(z, S) = |x - z|$. Then, as $\mathbf{u}(z) > 1$,

$$\mathbf{G}(z,y,v) - 1 = \int_0^1 D_x\mathbf{G}(tz + (1-t)x, y, v) \cdot (z - x)\,\mathrm{d}t > 0$$

(recall (2.4)), from which we see that $z \notin E_{x,y}$.

if δ is sufficiently small depending on K. Using (5.2), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\det(D^2\mathbf{w}^+(x) - D_x^2\mathbf{G}(x, \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{w}^+(x)}(\nabla\mathbf{w}^+(x)), \mathbf{H}(x, \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{w}^+(x)}(\nabla\mathbf{w}^+(x)), \mathbf{w}^+(x))))}{|\det(\mathbf{E}(x, \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{w}^+(x)}(\nabla\mathbf{w}^+(x)), \mathbf{H}(x, \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{w}^+(x)}(\nabla\mathbf{w}^+(x)), \mathbf{w}^+(x))))|} \\
&\qquad \geq \frac{\det((1+\sqrt{\delta}+4\varepsilon)D^2\mathbf{w}^+(x))}{1+\delta} \\
&\qquad \geq (1+\sqrt{\delta}+4\varepsilon)^n(1-2\delta)\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} \\
&\qquad \geq (1+4n\varepsilon)\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, thanks to (5.7), (5.2), and that $\delta^{\gamma/\tau} = \delta^{1/4} \gg \delta$, we have that

$$D^2\mathbf{w}^+ > \|D_x^2\mathbf{G}\|_{C^0(B_K\times B_K\times B_K)}\,\mathrm{Id} \quad \text{in } \operatorname{co}[S].$$

Thus, for any $x, z \in Z$, $x \neq z$, $y = \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{w}^+(x)}(\nabla\mathbf{w}^+(x))$, which is well-defined by (5.8) and as we have assumed that $\nabla\mathbf{u}(S) \Subset \operatorname{dom}\mathbf{G}\text{-exp}$, we deduce that

$$\mathbf{w}^+(z) - \mathbf{G}(z,y,v) = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 \big(D^2\mathbf{w}^+(tz+(1-t)x) - D_x^2\mathbf{G}(tz+(1-t)x,y,v)\big)(z-x)\cdot(z-x)\,\mathrm{d}t > 0,$$

where $v := \mathbf{H}(z, y, \mathbf{w}^+(z))$. In other words, the $\mathbf{G}$-support $\mathscr{G}_{z,y,v}$ only touches $\mathbf{w}^+$ at x, and the map $x \mapsto \mathbf{G}\text{-exp}_{x,\mathbf{w}^+(x)}(\nabla\mathbf{w}^+(x))$ is injective in Z. Therefore, Lemma 5.1 yields

$$|\mathbf{G}\text{-exp}(\nabla\mathbf{w}^+(Z))| \geq (1+4n\varepsilon)\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}|Z|.$$

On the other hand, since $\mathbf{u}$ is C^1 in S, the push-forward condition and (5.1) imply that

$$|\mathbf{T}_\mathbf{u}(Z)| = \int_Z \frac{f(x)}{g(\mathbf{T}_\mathbf{u}(x))}\,\mathrm{d}x \leq \frac{\lambda_1(1+\varepsilon)}{\lambda_2(1-\varepsilon)}|Z| \leq (1+3\varepsilon)\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}|Z|.$$

Combining these last two inequalities, we find that (5.9) is impossible unless Z is empty. That is, $\mathbf{w}^+ \leq \mathbf{u}$ in S.

The other barrier estimate follows arguing in the same way after making the same modification outlined in the proof of [1, Proposition 5.2]. □

Recall, $\mathcal{B}_3 := B_3 \times B_3 \times (-30, 30)$. With Proposition 5.2 in hand, our final theorem follows arguing exactly as in the proof of its optimal transport counterpart [1, Theorem 5.3]. So, its proof is omitted.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $\mathcal{C}_1$, $\mathcal{C}_2$, $\mathbf{u}$, f, g, δ_0, and η_0 be as in Theorem 4.3. Suppose that $\mathbf{G} \in C^{k,\alpha}(\mathcal{B}_3)$ and $f, g \in C^{k,\alpha}(B_{1/3})$ for some $k \geq 0$ and $\alpha \in (0,1)$. There exist positive constants $\delta_1 \leq \delta_0$ and $\eta_1 \leq \eta_0$ such that the following holds: if*

$$\|f - \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}_1}\|_{L^\infty} + \|g - \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}_2}\|_{L^\infty} \leq \delta_1, \tag{5.10}$$

$$\|\mathbf{G} - x\cdot y + v\|_{C^2(\mathcal{B}_3)} + \|\mathbf{H} - x\cdot y + v\|_{C^2(\mathcal{B}_3)} \leq \delta_1, \tag{5.11}$$

and

$$\left\|\mathbf{u} - \frac{1}{2}|x|^2\right\|_{C^0(B_3)} \leq \eta_1, \tag{5.12}$$

then $\mathbf{u} \in C^{k+2,\alpha}(B_{1/9})$.

Acknowledgments. I would like to thank Alessio Figalli for suggesting this problem.

References

[1] G. De Philippis and A. Figalli, *Partial regularity for optimal transport maps*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. (2015), no. 121, 81-112.

[2] L.C. Evans and R.F. Gariepy, "Measure Theory and Fine Properties of Functions", CRC Press Inc. Boca Raton, 1992.

[3] A. Fathi and A. Figalli, Optimal transportation on non-compact manifolds, Israel J. Math. **175** (2010), no. 1, 1-59.

[4] A. Figalli, "The Monge-Ampère Equation and its Applications", Zürich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics (to appear).

[5] A. Figalli and Y.-H. Kim, *Partial regularity of Brenier solutions of the Monge-Ampère equation*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **28** (2010), no. 2, 559-565.

[6] N. Guillen and J. Kitagawa, *Pointwise estimates and regularity in geometric optics and other generated Jacobian equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. (to appear).

[7] X.-N. Ma, N.S. Trudinger, and X.-J. Wang *Regularity of potential functions of the optimal transportation problem*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **177** (2005), no. 2, 151-183.

[8] N.S. Trudinger, *On the local theory of prescribed Jacobian equations*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **34** (2014), no. 4, 1663-1681.

[9] C. Villani, "Optimal Transport, Old and New", Grundlehren des mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], Vol. 338, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2009.

ETH Zürich, Department of Mathematics, Rämistrasse 101, Zürich 8092, Switzerland
E-mail address: yash.jhaveri@math.ethz.ch